REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were presented for examination. Claims 5, 10, 15, 18, 23, and 26 have been canceled. Thus, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19-22, 24 and 25 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 19 and 24 being independent. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24 and 25 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644 to Devine, and rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious from U.S. Patent No. 5,745,754 to Lagarde in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,258 to Barry. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As recited in independent claim 1, the present invention relates to a method for generating reports, based on information in telecommunication provisioning and inventorying databases. In the method, one of a plurality of servers on a network presents a user at a client with a page offering parameters for formulating a first report containing information regarding telephone numbers in a catalogue of numbers stored in a database corresponding to that server. The server also presents the user with a page offering parameters for formulating another report containing information regarding telephone numbers in another catalogue stored in a database corresponding to another server on the network. The user selects parameters upon which the first report is to be formulated and scheduled, and parameters upon which the second report is to be formulated and scheduled. The server interfaces with its corresponding database to retrieve

information designated by the parameters upon which the first report is to be formulated and scheduled, and generates the first report in accordance with those parameters.

Claim 6 is directed to a plurality of servers for generating reports. Claim 11 is directed to computer code running on a server for generating reports. Claim 16 is directed to a method of a client for ordering reports. Claim 19 is directed to an apparatus operating as a server for generating a report, and claim 24 is directed to an apparatus operating as a client for ordering reports. All of these independent claims recite the salient features discussed above with respect to claim 1, namely a server on a network presenting a client with a page offering parameters for formulating a first report containing information regarding one or more telephone numbers in a particular catalogue of telephone numbers stored in a database corresponding to the server, and parameters for formulating another report containing information regarding one or more telephone numbers in a particular catalogue of telephone numbers stored in a database corresponding to another server on the network.

Companies offering telecommunications services, such as landline telephone, wireless telephone, Internet or other services, typically maintain tremendous databases regarding the provisioning and inventorying of the services that they provide. Such databases include, for each assigned telephone number, the name of the customer to which the number is assigned, the terminal location to which the services are provided, the features associated with the number (such as, for example, speed dialing, call waiting, caller identification, call forwarding and the like), and other information necessary to effectively administer and manage services provisioning.

Typically, there is a hierarchical structure to the way the telephone numbers in a telecommunication company's database are organized. For example, telephone numbers assigned to geographically proximate locations are typically given the same first three digits and grouped into an exchange; all exchanges serviced by the same switch are grouped into a wire center; and wire centers in the same region (such as, for example, the Southwestern United States) are grouped into catalogues.

Routinely, those administering the provisioning of telecommunication services must access the stored data so that it may be reviewed. Such a task is conventionally accomplished by generating a report which recalls the data and presents it in a format that is readily understandable. For example, an administrator may desire a report which sets forth all of the telephone numbers in a given exchange that have subscribed for a given feature in a given exchange, such as express dialing in the exchange designated by the numbers "978" of area code "813". Such a report, as might be expected, is generated by specialized software which reviews the data looking for those numbers that fit the specified parameters, and compiles and outputs a resultant listing.

Conventionally, such report-generating software is text-based, and is run on mainframe systems, with a different mainframe dedicated to and accessing a database for each catalogue. Thus, for a large telecommunications company that provides services in multiple catalogues throughout the country, a separate report must be requested from each mainframe, if a company-wide result is desired.

The present invention overcomes this drawback by utilizing a client-server architecture, in which a server on a network provides a client with a page offering parameters for formulating a first report containing information regarding telephone numbers in a particular catalogue of numbers stored in a database corresponding to the server, and a page for formulating another report containing information regarding telephone numbers in a catalogue of numbers stored in a database corresponding to another server on the network. This inventive arrangement allows a client interacting with a single server to formulate, schedule and obtain reports regarding multiple catalogues throughout the country.

Devine relates generally to a multi-threaded Web based user inbox for report management. Devine shows a so-called inbox server that stores and maintains customer data, that includes report data and notification data received from one or more Intranet application servers. The inbox server also stores a metadata description of the report data, representing report standards and options for customizing the report standards.

However, there is nothing in Devine to teach or suggest multiple databases, each of which stores a particular catalogue of telephone numbers, let alone anything to teach or suggest a server on a network providing a client a page for formulating a first report containing information regarding the catalogue of numbers stored in its corresponding database, and a page for formulating another report containing information regarding another catalogue of numbers stored in a database corresponding to another server on the network. Absent these features, Devine can certainly not anticipate the pending claims.

Legarde teaches a sub-agent for fulfilling requests of a Web browser, in which multiple databases of different types may be purportedly accessed using a single user request from a client. But it has nothing whatsoever to do with telecommunication services. Instead, it is directed to a way of requesting and processing and presenting information on the World Wide Web. In fact, it is specifically directed at solving the problems caused by the fact that the Web's back-bone – the Internet – is "an unruly network of networks, a confederation of many different nets, public and private, big and small, that have agreed to connect to one another" (col. 3:41-44).

The present invention, of course, is not directed to an "unruly network of networks", but rather to a network including plural servers, each of which has a corresponding database that stores a particular catalogue of telephone numbers. Langarde, therefore, is completely inapposite, does not teach or suggest subject matter of Applicants' claims, and cannot possibly render obvious the pending claims.

Barry was cited in the Office Action for its teachings regarding Scheduling parameters. It does not teach or suggest any of the salient features of the present invention discussed above, and does not correct the deficiencies of Lagarde.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 19 and 24 are plainly patentable over Devine, Lagarde and Barry, and any combination of those documents, and respectfully request the Examiner to remove the corresponding section 102 and 103 rejections.

The remaining claims all depend from one of independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 19 and 24, and each partakes in the novelty and non-obviousness of its respective base claims. The dependent claims also recite additional patentable features of the present invention, and individual reconsideration and allowance of each is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 07-2347. If an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above is required, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Joel Wall

Reg. No. 25,648

Date: February 11, 2004

c/o Christian R. Andersen VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC. HQE03H14 600 Hidden Ridge Drive Irving, TX 75038 (972) 718-4800

Customer Number 32127